

Cabinet

Supplementary Information



Date: Tuesday, 14 July 2020

Time: 4.00 pm

Venue: Virtual Meeting - Zoom Committee Meeting
with Public Access via YouTube

2. Public Forum

(Pages 3 - 32)

Issued by: Corrina Haskins, Democratic Services

City Hall, Bristol, BS1 5TR

Tel: 0117 35 76519

E-mail: democratic.services@bristol.gov.uk

Date: Monday, 13 July 2020



CABINET – 14 July 2020

PUBLIC FORUM ITEMS

Statements and questions have been received as follows (full details are attached):

Agenda item 8 – Alternative Learning Provision (ALP) framework 2016-2021

None

Agenda item 9 – Community Child Health Partnership contract extension

None

Agenda item 10 - City Centre Development

Statements:

PS10.01	David Redgewell
PS10.02	Avison Young
PS10.03	Gordon Richardson

Agenda item 11 - City Leap Procurement

Statements:

PS11.01	Cllr Geoff Gollop
---------	-------------------

Questions:

CQ11.01	Cllr Steve Smith
CQ11.02&03	Cllr Jerome Thomas
CQ11.04	Cllr Anthony Negus
CQ11.05&06	Cllr Geoff Gollop
CQ11.07&08	Cllr Claire Hiscott
CQ11.09&10	Cllr Mark Weston

Agenda item 12- Highways Electrical Assets Contract

None

Agenda item 13 - South Bristol Light Industrial Workspace

None

Agenda item 14 - Council Tax Reduction scheme 2021/22

Statements:

CS14.01	Cllr Don Alexander
---------	--------------------

Questions:

CQ14.01	Cllr Anthony Negus
---------	--------------------

Agenda item 15 – Income systems contract extension

None

Agenda item 16 - 2020/21 Period 2 (May) Finance Report

Statements:

PS16.01 South West Transport Network and Railfuture Severnside.

Questions:

CQ16.01 Cllr Clive Stevens

Agenda item 17 - Redevelopment of Colston Hall

Statements:

CS17.01 Cllr Cleo Lake

Questions:

CQ17.01 Cllr Clive Stevens

Agenda item 18 – Advancing equality and inclusion at Bristol City Council

Statements:

PS18.01 Bristol Disability Forum

PS18.02 Bristol Older People’s Forum

Questions:

PQ18.01&02 David Redgewell

CQ18.01&02 Cllr Cleo Lake

Agenda item 19 – Quarterly Performance Progress Report (Quarter 4 - 2019/20)

None

Statement: PS10.01

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 10 – City Centre Development

Statement submitted by: David Redgewell

We are very pleased to see the removal of the private car from the old city and Baldwin Street and especially the closure of Bristol Bridge to the private car. This will also improve air quality. The bus gate at Bristol Bridge is to be welcomed and improvements for walking and cycling routes. It is also important to allow taxi access.

We would like to see:

- the building in the High Street redeveloped by the mayor of the derelict buildings which are an eyesore to residents and visitors to Bristol;
- Historic castle park and castle ruins as destinations for residents and tourists;
- the mayor make this a top priority like Bristol temple meads station.

On public transport we welcome the bus system, the pavements and bus stops in Nelston street need widening and drop kerbs, in Castle Street the pavement are very narrow and need more space for social distancing.

The removal of the private car is to be welcomed with walking and cycling.

The showcase bus route through the city centre and Broadmead is to be welcomed as it's an important link cross city bus route no 2 between Stockwood, Knowle, Bristol Temple mead station, Broadmead, Clifton Down, Henleaze, Southmead, Henbury and cribbs causeway bus station. This route is an important part of the city bus deal with Bristol mayor and the metro mayor and the west of England combined Transport authority.

The scheme need be designed to allow for disabled passengers wheelchair users and blind people with guide dogs especially those who are unable to social distance.

We welcome the bus operations via Fairfax street and Broadwear to allowed more social distancing in Broadmead and cabot circus.

The plan needs to include more public toilets, especially in castle park, the city centre and around the bus station area.

We need a changing place and public toilets in the city centre.

The only ones at present are at cribbs causeway shopping centre and Bristol temple circus offices.

The public realm is very important and need good quality pavements and open spaces.

The redevelopment of the bear pit would be welcomed including filling it in and a new road layout.

Improvements to Bus stopping facilities on the Haymarket would be welcomed, but would be concerned about if all traffic is redirected via the Bristol Royal infirmary with its hospitals and poor air quality.

It is very important that light rail system is included in the plan for the future around the Victoria street, Bristol Bridge and the city centre towards North Bristol and south through Bristol Temple meads station towards south Bristol.

Links towards oid market need redesigning with bus stops being moved and pavements widening.

Both through oid market street and west street. To invest in gay villages and LGBTQ community.

Improvements also need to be made to the ferry terminal and disabled access.

With regard to public transport access we are concerned about the lack of evening and weekend service on the Bristol and Bath city region bus network and would ask the metro mayor to restore these bus service as soon as possible including daily links from Bristol to Bath via Bitton route 37 35 Bristol to Kingswood and Marshfield.

Weekend services to Weston super mare x2x8 to Nailsea 178 to Midsomer Norton and Radstock x7 p to chepstow.

The Government has asked weca mayoral transport authority to look at evening and weekend service. Following the shops restaurant and public Houses being opened. On 4th July 2020.

We fully support this city centre plan it's most important that public transport is improved to the city centre including portway parkway railway station M32 bus lanes and a park and ride site.

The plan still needs to improve coach station and parking facilities within the city centre. As a major west country Tourist destination.

Statement: PS10.02

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 10 – City Centre Development

Statement submitted by: Jo Davis, Avison Young

This submission has been prepared by Avison Young on behalf of Cubex & LaSalle in response to the Committee Report published ahead of next Wednesday's 14th July 2020 Bristol City Council (BCC) Cabinet Meeting. This note seeks to reflect in particular discussions that have taken place to date between BCC and Cubex & LaSalle on 9 June 2020.

My client welcomes the commissioning of a City Centre Development & Delivery Plan following the adoption of the City Centre Framework to provide a clear, holistic and visionary set of guidelines giving developers and investors more certainty in their approach when considering development in the city centre. However we are concerned about the lack of engagement undertaken between the Council and stakeholders since the document was last published in draft in March 2018. We would also challenge the evidence base to support the Aims set out in the Framework which potentially undermine the strategy.

Having reviewed the June 2020 version of the document we wish to make a number of comments:

My client cannot support **Aim 14 'Creating a balanced and mix of landuse'** and its visualisation in Figure 9 in its current form for the following reasons:

The report sets out that the purpose of **Aim 14** is to ensure the focus of any redevelopment in the Broadmead and St James Barton area is primarily on '*retail, leisure, workspace, culture and entertainment uses.*'

This Aim is then visualised in the area colour washed red on **figure 9 'mixed use development retail/leisure emphasis'** which currently equates to over 60% of the Framework Area.

This approach (Aim 14 & Figure 9) was not commercially viable at the drafting of the Framework Document in 2018 due to the challenges faced by the retail sector at that time. However, since 2018, we have seen the decline of the retail sector accelerate. Even before Covid-19 the scale of retail/leisure proposed in the Fig. 9 of the Framework was commercial unrealistic. Covid 19 Lockdown has only intensified the demise of town centre retailing. The Centre for Retail Research April 2020 predicts 20 000 stores will not trade gain post Covid19; Retail Economics stated pre-Covid-19 there were 306 655 retail store in the UK so this equates to 6.5% contraction in retail units. These figure exclude food retail and food and beverage. This underscores urgency to create a flexible and pro-investor City Centre Framework to accelerate the repurposing of our city centre. Without a positive and pro-active introduction of new landuses targeting residential led regeneration blocks the Private Sector will be unable to invest in and contribute to the ambitions of Framework on public realm,

movement and open space and the City Centre Development & Delivery Plan the Framework is seeking to support.

This appears to be a missed opportunity for the Framework to champion a radical regenerative approach to ensure a framework predicated on a resilient and balanced city centre, with a reinvented primary role.

More concerning, is the Framework acknowledges there is no evidence base to support this approach (**Aim 14 & fig 9**). The final sentence in the first paragraph on Aim 14 which states '*a retail and leisure study will inform the future approach*'. This directly implies that the Framework has no evidence base to inform on the nature and mix of land uses across the city centre. It is our view the current approach will not only prohibit investment in key development block in the city centre coming forward but potentially undermine and dilute ability for city centre to create a targeted, albeit contracted resilience Shopping Quarter. We would wish to see the outputs of (and engage in the preparation of the Retail & Leisure Study) to ensure the Framework has a robust evidence base to inform any future redevelopment proposals.

Under 'Aim 17: Building retention and reuse' (p.26, June 2020) the Framework has been updated to include the following paragraph:

The existing Primark and Debenhams buildings are distinctive elements of the street scene on Horsefair/ Bond Street and some of the more distinguished and recognisable structures to survive from the post war redevelopment scheme. If these buildings are considered for re-use or redevelopment, proposals should carefully consider how they contribute to the character of the area, including consideration of retention and re-use, extension or sensitive redevelopment which retains existing character features.

It should be noted that the Primark and Debenhams buildings are not listed or locally listed. While their prominent location, scale and the way they define the part of Broadmead within which they are located is of note and does make the buildings 'stand out', it is not clear in what other way they are distinctive. In particular the buildings have never been recognised for architectural merit or previously highlighted in any BCC Policy documents as buildings of merit. There is no justification behind the aspiration to retain these buildings and indeed no clear indication of what the 'existing character features' of these buildings are.

In addition, the buildings were specifically designed to host department stores, with very deep floor plates and layouts to suit that purpose and use. We are concerned that setting an ambition for retention and re-use of these buildings in the Framework does not consider the potential complexities of doing so. Bristol, and for that matter the majority of towns and cities across the country, now has a significant over supply of retail accommodation following structural change to the sector over many years. The rate of decline will in all likelihood be further exacerbated as the long term impacts of Covid-19 take effect. Large floorplate department store buildings (now 70 years old in the case of Debenhams) have little prospect of remaining in full retail use and adaptation of bespoke buildings of this nature to alternative use presents significant challenges.

This Aim is an assumption which is not backed by feasibility work or an investigation of the actual potential for the buildings to be re-used. Indeed this introduces early risk and investor uncertainty into what should be a positive discussion about the regeneration of key and prominent city centre sites. The ambition should instead be to promote the highest quality of design approaches to ensure that, should retention be unviable or unrealistic, buildings of equal or arguably greater architectural merit

are erected in place of the post-war blocks. It is essential this Framework positively seeks to channel investment, redevelopment, and the potential to stimulate wider regeneration, should be encouraged provided such proposals are compliant with the Council's other policy framework aspirations".

The above is particularly true in the context of the introductory note in Section 1 of the updated Framework which states: '*There is a need to be flexible and adaptable response to economic, environmental, social and technological changes, and ensure that the success of the city centre is shared and inclusive to all people across the whole city*'.

We urge the Cabinet to take the above comments into consideration and to seek a further review of the Framework, ideally informed by a further round of stakeholder engagement before final adoption. This is to be a key document to inform the regeneration of the heart of Bristol and it ought to be as forward thinking as possible if it is to encourage new development, growth and positive change.

With the above in mind, the Framework should also reflect on and include the Government's latest changes to the planning system due to come into force from September announced by the Prime Minister in his 30th June 2020 'Build, Build, Build' speech including:

- Providing further flexibility for more types of commercial premises to be repurposed through reform of the Use Classes Order. This would for instance mean that a building used for retail could be able to be permanently used as a café or office without requiring a planning application and local authority approval. This would be directly relevant to both the Primark and Debenhams buildings and many more premises within the city centre.
- Allowing a wider range of commercial buildings to change to residential use without the need for a planning application.

These changes could positively impact upon the ambitions of the Framework but may also assist in a speedier delivery of change and therefore the Council should consider what impact the relaxation of planning powers may have on the make-up of the city centre before adopting the Framework as currently written.

Statement: PS10.03

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 10 – City Centre Development

Statement submitted by: Gordon Richardson

There is a need to maintain disabled parking spaces under the new developments and that these should be within accessible walking / wheeling range of buildings which disabled people need to visit. Where manual wheelchairs are used the route needs to be reasonably level. In many of the discussions I have had with Council officers they were not aware of the problems.

Additionally they could make concessions to allow disabled exempt licence holders through bus and taxi routes if this allows them to park reasonably close to their destination. I say exempt licence holders as these numbers are held by ANPR cameras.

Question: CS11.01

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 – City Leap Procurement

Statement submitted by: Councillor Geoff Gollop

There is a responsibility on the Mayor and the Council as a whole to ensure clarity and transparency on all things, but particularly when there is a high level of public interest and concern, This applies particularly to City Leap and Bristol Energy. I know how much care and attention goes in to preparing answers for questions at Cabinet, which leaves me concerned when the answers are changed after they have been given in public.

At the June cabinet meeting The Mayor answered my questions on City Leap by confirming that “Bristol Energy had received £1.2m for innovation services for the City Leap program, on the energy service and a number of energy innovation projects” part of which went to fund the first EY report into Bristol Energy. You also advised me that “the second EY report into Bristol Energy cost the Local Authority Four Hundred and Forty Thousand Pounds and it was funded from within the Bristol Energy agreed funding envelope” You confirmed that figure by repeating it in answer to my supplementary, but by the next morning I had an email correction telling me the figure was significantly less at £145K.

This cabinet paper shows total procurement costs for City Leap of £6.5m, but amounts paid out in May alone raise more questions than they answer(attached for information). Under the description City Leap Prospectus, EY were paid 4 amounts totalling £531,504. If that was netted down for 20% VAT it comes to £442,920. A figure which is remarkably close to Marvin’s first answer of £440k. One of the figures paid to EY was a payment for £145,000 also coded to the prospectus, but exactly the figure that Marvin said was the revised cost of the second EY report.

It is difficult to have any confidence in the figures when there is so much contradictory evidence already in the public domain.

Also included in the payments for May was a figure of £224,400 paid to Bristol Energy for the prospectus, described as “Unallocated Budget Amendments”. At OSM we were told this was a posting error but received no explanation of why this amount was paid to Bristol Energy.

This information is publicly available, but it appears that there is an unacceptably casual attitude to information that is provided.

It is difficult to tell whether the Council paid EY £440,00 for the BE report or whether it was £145,000. If the lower figure we need a detailed explanation of why the Council paid the amount when the Mayor said the Energy Company paid it out of its own resources. If these payments to EY were all for City Leap, why were they billing for work at a time when the report tells us procurement was suspended. Professional

Service firms bill the moment their work is complete not months after that tranche of work was finished.

The confusion continues because the payment of £224k to Bristol energy is also far from clear. There were no budget amendments to be allocated to either Bristol Energy or City Leap.

I find myself questioning why none of this adds up to a truthful explanation. Please use the response to questions on this issue to provide a full and credible explanation of what has happened.

Extracts from payments over £500 for May
Allocated to City Leap Prospectus

Bristol City council	http://data.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/doc/7000000000025523	Ernst & Young LLP	19,076.00	15/05/20	30803447	Services - Consultants	City Leap Prospectus
Bristol City council	http://data.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/doc/7000000000025523	Ernst & Young LLP	145,000.00	14/05/20	30802957	Services - Consultants	City Leap Prospectus
Bristol City council	http://data.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/doc/7000000000025523	Ernst & Young LLP	202,428.66	13/05/20	30802581	Services - Consultants	City Leap Prospectus
Bristol City council	http://data.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/doc/7000000000025523	Ernst & Young LLP	<u>165,000.00</u>	22/05/20	30804581	Services - Consultants	City Leap Prospectus
			531,504.66				
		Theoretical VAT calculation					
		Net	442,920.55				
		Vat	88,584.11				
		Gross	531,504.66				
Bristol City council	http://data.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/doc/7000000000025523	Carlisle Staffing PLC T/A Guidant Global	2,189.36	14/05/20	30803134	Agency Staff	City Leap Prospectus
Bristol City council	http://data.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/doc/7000000000025523	Carlisle Staffing PLC T/A Guidant Global	2,189.36	11/05/20	30801781	Agency Staff	City Leap Prospectus
Bristol City council	http://data.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/doc/7000000000025523	Carlisle Staffing PLC T/A Guidant Global	2,189.36	04/05/20	30800220	Agency Staff	City Leap Prospectus
Bristol City council	http://data.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/doc/7000000000025523	Carlisle Staffing PLC T/A Guidant Global	2,189.36	29/05/20	30805376	Agency Staff	City Leap Prospectus
Bristol City council	http://data.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/doc/7000000000025523	Carlisle Staffing PLC T/A Guidant Global	2,189.36	21/05/20	30804304	Agency Staff	City Leap Prospectus
Bristol City council	http://data.ordnancesurvey.co.uk/doc/7000000000025523	Bristol Energy	224400	07/05/20	80030952	Unallocated Budget Amendments	City Leap Prospectus

Question: CQ11.1

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 – City Leap Procurement

Question submitted by: Councillor Steve Smith

Please could you expand on what changes are proposed to the procurement - what is it that we were previously planning to procure which is no longer to be included, or vice versa?

Question: CQ11.02&03

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 – City Leap Procurement

Question submitted by: Councillor Jerome Thomas

Background

I am concerned with City Leap that the council has spent a lot of time and money making very little progress and I am concerned that investing further in the procurement process may not be good use of money.

In December 2017 you went to China to seek investment for £800million to £1 billion of low carbon energy infrastructure. Seeking investment in low carbon energy infrastructure is a worthwhile goal. In May 2018, the council sent out a prospectus for City Leap and in December 2018 it was reported that 180 organisations had expressed an interest. Given the length of time that you and your team have been working on this, Bristol residents would have hoped to have seen some progress on this by now, with expressions of interest being turned into actual investment.

Instead in July 2020 we find out that the procurement process has been so flawed that it has had to be abandoned at a cost to the city of over £4million. It appears yet again that more money has been spent on lawyers and consultants rather than the essential services and investments that the city needs.

Hopefully in your answers to my questions you will be able to reassure me that the money spent on City Leap procurement has not been wasted and there remains a credible possibility of third party investment in the city's low carbon energy infrastructure.

Questions

- 1) What value has been achieved for the city in the £4.2million (as at 31 March 2020) that has been spent on the failed City Leap procurement exercise?;
- 2) Now that the council under the Mayor's leadership has lost over £30 million on Bristol Energy, and Bristol Energy can no longer be bundled into any City Leap assets, precisely what is it that the Mayor is planning to sell to external investors within the City Leap 'wrapper' that can justify spending a further £2million plus on procurement?

Question: CQ11.04

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 – City Leap Procurement

Question submitted by: Councillor Anthony Negus

Since none of this is commercially sensitive and presumably common to all, will the mayor ensure that all the reasons, and the legal advice behind it, for stopping the tender process are explained, along with the related risks and that the length of delay and the weighting of the required outcomes from the scheme is made public?

Question: CQ11.05&06

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 – City Leap Procurement

Question submitted by: Councillor Geoff Gollop

At the June Cabinet meeting you answered my questions on City Leap by confirming that:-

“Bristol Energy had received £1.2m for innovation services for the City Leap program, on the energy service and a number of energy innovation projects” part of which went to fund the first EY report into Bristol Energy.

You also advised me that “the second EY report into Bristol Energy cost the Local Authority Four Hundred and Forty Thousand Pounds and it was funded from within the Bristol Energy agreed funding envelope.” You confirmed that figure by repeating it in answer to my supplementary, but, by the next morning, I had an email correction telling me the figure was significantly less at £145K.

This Cabinet paper shows total procurement costs for City Leap of £6.5m.

Q.1 How much of that money was or will be paid to EY?

Q.2 How much has been paid to EY in the current Financial Year?

Question: CQ11.07&08

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 – City Leap Procurement

Question submitted by: Councillor Claire Hiscott

Q.1 There were weekly payments to Guidant on 4th, 11th, 14th, 21st and 29th May 2020, each for £2189.36 and classified as Agency Staff - City Leap Prospectus. I assume these are included in core agency staff. Can you explain what role or roles this relates to?

Q.2 Please can you confirm how many staff are included in the Core Teams of BCC staff and internal professionals (shown in the table on page 4 of the report) and explain their roles?

Question: CQ11.09&10

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 11 – City Leap Procurement

Question submitted by: Councillor Mark Weston

Q1. Can the Mayor provide a breakdown and definitive total figure for the sum(s) paid to EY for both of their reports concerning the energy company?

Q2. Can you assure me that no energy professionals, advisors or specialists involved in the Bristol Energy debacle will be involved in the new City Leap procurement process?

Question: CS14.1

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 14 – Council Tax Reduction Scheme

Statement submitted by: Councillor Don Alexander

Given the damage caused to the council's finances by the Government's confused and indecisive response to the pandemic, the decision to retain the Council Tax Reduction Scheme is a clear statement of intent to continue to support the most disadvantaged citizens in the city and I welcome it.

Question: CQ14.01

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 14 – Council Tax Reduction Scheme

Question submitted by: Councillor Anthony Negus

The LibDems have fought twice to save this scheme when it was one of the areas under pressure during budget cuts but if a Cabinet decision is to be meaningful it should be based on some level of information.

My first query about this report at Scrutiny was why it was crucial that it should come to Cabinet now, rather than when there was better information. I was told that this was to allow for a consultation should it not be approved but then was told that any extra money would be found. In that case, with no consultation envisaged, why could this report not have been delayed so that it contained more helpful information.

This report is premature and so does not contain any predictions on the effect from Covid on potential demand on this scheme, the possible range of additional funds required to support it and where these are to come from.

Will the mayor withdraw or defer this report?

Statement: PS16.01

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 16 – 2020/21 Period 2 (May) Finance Report

Statement submitted by: South West Transport Network and Railfuture Severnside

We are still very concerned about the west of England bus recovery plan but pleased with the progress being made by the on bringing back bus services.

From the 2nd of August 2020 the Trunk route between Bath spa bus and coach station to Weston, Kelson, Bitton, Longwell Green, Hanham, St George, Lawrence Hill station, Bristol bus and coach station.

We still have 11 routes still not operational including route 18 Bath bus and coach station via Keynsham, 178 Bristol to Radstock via Brislington and Keynsham, 96 Brislington to Hengrove via Knowle, X2 Bristol bus station to Yatton, Worle to Weston super Mare.

With government instructions to bring the network back to 80% we do not have a proper bus service to Marshfield for the last 4 months. The Marshfield to Bristol city centre bus service stopped operation without any public consultation due to Covid-19.

As on the 31st march 2020 this was a south Gloucestershire council tender bus service, can we again ask WECA mayoral transport authority if this service is to be re-tendered or reinstated.

We wish urgently to see routes bus routes y2 Bristol bus and coach station to yate bus station and chipping sodbury evening service reinstated via Fishponds. Bristol Bus and coach station service reinstated via Gloucester road and cribbs causeway bus station to Thornbury on route T2.

There is an urgent need for these services to be reinstated for local journeys in the evening.

WECA mayoral transport authority has a duty under Government guidance on Covid 19 bus operators grant but is failing to carry this out with passengers consultation like Somerset county council Wiltshire or Gloucestershire county council. The government is not expecting Transport authority to reinstate evening and weekend service. This is now being put into operation in Gloucester Cheltenham and Stroud. Swindon Bournemouth Poole and Christchurch. Cornwall and Plymouth. In south west region it is very disappointing that we still have no public enquiry line at WECA mayoral transport authority since public transport services transfer from Bristol city council, south Gloucestershire county council and Bath and North east Somerset.

There is an urgent need for enforcement of face covering on public transport please can this be raised with Sue Mountsteven the police and crime commissioner and chief constable Andy Marsh, Bristol port police and the British transport police. As bus regulations have changed to allow 18 passengers on a single decker and 35 on a double decker bus .60 on a 3 car train. On the Bristol Temple meads Filton Abbey wood. Bristol parkway, Yate, Cam and Dursey and Gloucester and Cheltenham the Severn Beach line and the main line to south Wales via Patchway and Pilning, we need regular deep cleaning of Buses and trains. Bus shelters bus and railway stations and enforcement on face coverings. Realtime information is still not operational on bus stops interchanges and bus stations.

On Tourist attractions do we have dates for the opening of south Gloucestershire museums. In Yate, Kingswood and Thornbury and other tourist information centres. Bristol and Bath tourist information centres have reopened but not Bristol museum service so museum have opened in Bath. In line with Bath Bristol Gloucester Cheltenham and North Somerset coast tourism is 1 .4 billion pound economy to Greater Bristol and Bath city region.

We would like to see progress in this area with the cotswolds and the coastal seaside town of Severn beach, Western gateway transport board.

We are also very very concerned about the consultation of the western gateway transport board plan and the lack of public consultation on a vital region plan during the covid 19 emergency. The fact that the region has 2 transport boards is not supported by any environmental or transport group holds us back this was the view of the region travel watch south west meeting.

We are concerned Somerset is split in half as a county like east and west Germany. Partition is good in British history and now exist in the 7 countries of the south west. The issue that concerns us are the lack of a clear region bus and coach network policy.

No clear investment strategy for Transport interchanges such as Bristol Temple meads station as a major station in south west England. Or Bristol parkway. No clear region important Bus or coach links such as Bristol bus and coach station to cribbs causeway bus station to chepstow bus station or Bath spa bus station to Trowbridge warmister, Salisbury, Bristol Bristol Airport, Churchill Bridgwater, Taunton, Cullompton, Exeter Newton abbot, Plymouth falcon coach services. Chepstow bus station to Gloucester bus station link or Thornbury to Gloucester bus station .Bristol bus and coach station to wells Glastonbury and street. We welcome the reference to Bristol Bath city region bus network and Gloucester Cheltenham bus network. Bournemouth Poole and Christchurch network. The plan has no rural transport policy.

We welcome the railway policy and reference to metro west and Region railway routes but we have no clear priority on station investment with Great Bristol competing with Bournemouth Poole and Christchurch Dorset for public transport network investment.

There again is a lot of list of rural roads improvements to in Wiltshire and Dorset.

The main railway network to from London Paddington to Bristol Temple meads to Penzance via Taunton, Exeter Plymouth is seen as less important than a road From Bristol to m4 to Poole.

Ports and Airports investment are not clear. Is investment more important in Poole port Weymouth or the port of Bristol or Bournemouth Airport or Bristol or Exeter.

The region main focus is not Bristol To Bath to Bournemouth Poole road systems

The main road and Rail links go to Gloucester Cheltenham Birmingham.

Bristol, Taunton, Exeter ,Plymouth and Cornwall.

Bristol to Newport and Cardiff.

Having seen clear investment plans by the Northern power house and The Midlands Engine this plan need considerable work on it and integration with the south west

transport board plans . This not a region transport plan for investment post covid 19

Having read the west Midlands plan this need a lot of work on it .These concerns

Are also Express by Sera south west and Transport for Greater Bristol. The closing

date is 31st of July 2020

Question: CQ16.01

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 16 – Period 2 (May) Finance Report

Question submitted by: Councillor Clive Stevens

I'm impressed that our Finance team have been able to split the risk of overspends into Covid vs non-Covid caused. That must have taken a lot of work and some assumptions. I can understand why it's important for holding departments to account and justifying claims to Government. Regarding assumptions, I see the Adult Social Care (ASC) non-Covid overspend risk is flagged up at £7.3m whereas the Covid impact is estimated at £19.3m.

In a situation where (anecdotally I hear) new service users were delaying going into care homes for as long as possible (which might have saved BCC money), I wonder would that be a Covid related saving or a non-Covid related.

So my question is: whether the Finance Team could document the big (say £1m+) assumptions made to divide the ASC variances between Covid and non-Covid?

Question: CS17.1

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 17 – Colston Hall Redevelopment

Statement submitted by: Councillor Cleo Lake

I have looked through various annual reports of Bristol Music Trust and whilst I acknowledge some of the incredible work that has been done including setting up various school orchestras and music provision for children in care for example, I was taken aback by reading that BMT receives over 1 million pounds a year of unrestricted funds from Bristol City Council. I can only presume that this pays for salaries as well as services. How many people of African heritage are on salaried roles at the Trust? I am very disappointed that yet again our tax money goes directly to the traditional seats of privilege in the city to deliver services for us as a black community rather than to us to deliver our own services. Many of us feel like a tick box in someone else's funding vision. I reflect on and contrast the 1 million pounds to the reality of the mere 60 thousand given to Carnival each year. This news hasn't been received well at all from others working in the arts and culture sector. Please do better for us. Building Back Better must come with a new approach.

Question: CQ17.01

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 17 – Colston Hall Redevelopment

Question submitted by: Councillor Clive Stevens

This was always going to be problematic and the list of structural issues plus heritage discoveries is long. Combine that with the Covid-19 impact and costs are on the increase. It gives me no pleasure to write that.

My question is actually about learning. Is there anything that could have been done earlier on (I mean 2017 or even earlier) that could have helped identify some of these issues and risks back then and so better informed your decision making?

Statement: CS18.01

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 18 – Advancing Equality and Inclusion at BCC

Statement submitted by: Bristol Disability Equality Forum

Bristol City Council has a good reputation for promoting equalities and diversity and working with community groups such as Bristol Disability Equality Forum, the LGBTQ forum and Black South West.

We welcome the equalities report to the cabinet and positive recruitment from the BAME community, LGBTQ and disabled staff. Covid- 19 has meant many of these organisations have had to keep going on very limited funding in the community.

Bristol Disability Equality Forum has worked with the City office on the Bristol mayor's Transport board covering the Covid-19 recovery plans and in particular the bus and rail network. We have also worked on wheelchair access social distancing and service planning for bus and rail services with the WECA mayoral Transport authority and North Somerset Council.

We have also been assisting by advising on social services provision, care homes provision, public toilets and disabled access. We have also maintained a helpline for disabled people within the city region.

With regard to the LGBTQ community there has been social isolation and problems with recovery from covid-19. We feel more could be done by the City council to help this community in Bristol. The potential lack of a forum, due to a loss of funding, is of concern to the community as it looks likely that the present forum will not be able to continue into the future.

Bristol is a very diverse city region with a concentration of the LGBTQ community in the area of the city around Old Market and Southville. We need more officers to support the community and enforce better social distancing measures in areas such as West Street, Old Market and Midland Road and especially in public houses and restaurants.

We are asking the mayor to look at investing equalities officer time in LGBTQ forum issues.

We also welcome the work by Asher Craig, Deputy mayor, with the BAME community and especially the Black South West network and the work of the equalities commission. We welcome the slavery museum project at M shed with the statue of Edward Colston. We hope the planned exhibition will give a balanced view of Colston's life including his involvement with the history of the Royal African Company, his substantial philanthropic contributions to the city and the additions he made to the built environment. Hopefully such an exhibition will bring about an informed debate on one part of Bristol's history.

This would also be a good opportunity to see better exhibition opportunities covering disabled history in the Bristol and Bath region and the history of LGBTQ rights in Bristol and the south west.

Bristol is a very diverse city with 1 in 6 citizens being a member of the BAME community and as such we welcome the work by the mayor on equalities.

We would welcome the setting up of an equalities committee by Mayor Bowles as part of WECA mayoral combined authority covering the nine protected characteristics.

We would like to see a more diverse staff balance at WECA and the employment of an equalities officer. We also note and support the leadership of South Gloucestershire Council, Banes and North Somerset council in equalities issues. With North Somerset Council joining WECA combined authority.

We welcome this report but wish to see Bristol and Bath at the heart of diversity in south west England.

Statement: CS18.02

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 18 – Advancing Equality and Inclusion at BCC

Statement submitted by: Bristol Older People's Forum

We would wish to support this report, and the measures proposed to embed race equality and diversity in everyone's daily business, and to tackle institutional racism. It is good to see, for example, that these measures aim to increase the representation of Black, Asian and other underrepresented groups in the workforce, including at senior levels of the organisation.

BOPF would also wish to see greater emphasis in the report on increasing diversity and promoting equality for older people and people with disabilities. Both of these groups experience significant discrimination in society, and this can be even more acute if a person is both older and has a disability. BOPF will soon be delivering, for example, Challenging Ageism Workshops for small businesses and charities, particularly focusing on how ageist stereotypes can be identified and tackled.

Question: CQ18.01&02

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 18 - Advancing equality and inclusion at Bristol City Council

Question submitted by: Councillor Cleo Lake

With specific reference to the report that came to Full Council on July 7th which underpins this agenda item, I have the following points to make and questions that I would like answers to.

Labels, ethnicity and discrimination

I would like to suggest as a council we work with communities of interest towards a definition and adopt the term 'Afriphobia', which is a more accurate grasp of a lived experience not necessarily summed up by the term 'racism.'

Questions:

1. The report in parts references 'Black and Minority Ethnic' and in others BAME. 'White minority ethnic' is also mentioned. Can you give a definition of white minority ethnic and can you confirm whether white minority ethnic is included in the blanket category BAME with regards to the ethnicity pay gap?

It is a good move that the council has decided to publish the ethnicity pay gap without being legally obliged to, but I feel we need a more detailed breakdown on specific ethnicity of the findings. (For example South Asian, African Caribbean, Dual Heritage Black Caribbean and white, Middle Eastern etc).

2. I am very concerned to read that disabled employees are over represented in grievances and disciplinaries, is there any explanation for this?

Question: CQ18.01&02

Cabinet – 14th July 2020

Re: Agenda item 18 - Advancing equality and inclusion at Bristol City Council

Question submitted by: David Redgewell Bristol Disability and Equalities Forum

- 1. Will the Council and Mayor please develop some kind of LGBTQ policy for staff and the community, such as Manchester City Council and Brighton and Hove City Council?**

The city and the region have a large number of LGBTQ communities in Southville and Old Market. To prevent equalities hate crime in the city region, there is still work to do on positive images of gay people within the city council and WECA mayoral combined authority to follow the work of the police and crime commissioner office; the chief constable of the Avon and Somerset police; the British transport police and companies like First group plc and Airbus.

- 2. In relation to disabled people, will the Mayor and City Council push public sector local authorities in Bristol City Council and WECA mayoral combined authority to employ more disabled staff to make sure that disabled people are included in decisions of Bristol City Council and the combined authority?**

The Mayor should promote positive service and support from all the city office partners by signing the city equalities charter and asking Mayor Bowles to set up an equalities forum at the mayoral transport authority especially as it delivers public transport network services and regional planning.